



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,496	11/28/2000	Zaid Joyyosi	02481.1691-00	6965

7590 09/16/2003  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP  
1300 I STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

LIU, HONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/724,496	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOYYOSI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hong Liu	<b>Art Unit</b> 1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,7,11,14,15,20-23,27,34-37,49-82,89,91 and 93-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 50-82 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2,7,11,14,15,20-23,27,34-37,49-82,89,91, and 93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 94-97 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 34-37, 49-82, 89, 91, 93, and 94 are pending in this application.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 30, 2003 has been entered.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 34-37, 49, 89, 91, 93, and 94, drawn to the compounds of formula I, classified in class 548, subclass 236.
  - II. Claims 50-82, drawn to different methods of using the compounds, classified in class 514, subclass 374.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case more than one use exists for compounds of Group I as evidenced by claims 50-82 drawn to a variety of diverse uses. Additionally, the various uses would raise issues of

Art Unit: 1624

enablement separate from that of the compound claims and would require art-recognized evidence that activity relied on its reasonably correlated to in vivo efficacy for the uses claimed.

2. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Steven Scott on 09/11/03 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-23, 27, 34-37, 49, 89, 91, 93, and 94. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 50-82 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-21, 23, 27, 49, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (US Patent 4,920,131). Huang teaches the compounds and composition of the instant invention (see Examples 7, col. 7).

Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-21, 23, 27, 49, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jayyosi et al. (US Patent 6,376,512). Jayyosi teaches the compounds and composition of the instant invention (see Examples, cols. 19-42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-21, 23, 27, 31, 34-37, 49, 89, 91, and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Jayyosi et al. (US Patent 6,376,512).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or

Art Unit: 1624

subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

The reference teaches a generic group of compounds which embraces applicant's instantly claimed compounds. See formula I, Col. 1 wherein A is O, S, or a chemical bond, B is O, S, SO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NR, a chemical bond, D is O, S, NR<sub>1</sub>, or a chemical bond, E is a chemical bond, Z is R<sub>1</sub>O<sub>2</sub>C-, tetrazolyl, etc. The compounds are taught to be useful as PPAR-gama receptor agonists or antagonists. The claims differ from the reference by reciting a specific species and/or a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have nevertheless been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the specie of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within a genus. See *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1624

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-2, 7, 11, 14, 15, 20-21, 23, 27, 31, 34-37, 49, 89, 91, and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for preparation and use of compounds wherein R1, R3, R5, R7, R9 do not form an ethylene group, does not reasonably provide enablement for preparation and use of compounds wherein R1, R3, R5, R7, R9, taken together with the carbon atoms to which the R group is linked form an ethylene group. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The nature of the invention in the instant application has claims which embrace a diversity of chemically and physically distinct compounds, wherein R1, R3, R5, R7, R9 can form various ring structure on the main chain of the molecule. While many compounds are disclosed, there is insufficient guidance for preparing additional PPAR-gama receptor agonists or antagonists which would be effective since the cited examples are drawn to a homogenous group of compounds not remotely commensurate in scope to applicants' claims. Only compounds wherein no R1, R3, R5, R7, and R9 form an ethylene group have been made.

Furthermore, no testing data is provided for any of the compounds. The definitions of the various R groups embrace many structurally divergent groups not represented at all in testing, since testing for the instant compounds is not seen in the specification. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure when the "working examples" fail to include written description(s) which teach how to make and use Markush members embraced thereby in full, clear and exact terms. See *In re Fouch*, 169 USPQ 429.

Art Unit: 1624

This area of activity can be expected to be highly structure specific and unpredictable, as is generally true for chemically-based pharmacological activity. In view of the structural divergence in the claims, one skilled in the art could not reasonably extrapolate the activities of some of the claimed compounds to the other structurally divergent compounds embraced by the claims which have not been tested. In cases directed to chemical compounds which are being used for their physiological activity, the scope of the claims must have a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification. See *In re Surrey* 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. No reasonable assurance has been made that the instant compounds as an entire class have the required activities needed to practice the invention.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability" have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the scope being claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 22 recites the limitation "phenyl," "cycloalkyl," etc. for the definition of AR1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.




Art Unit: 1624

*Claim Objections*

Claims 94-97 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. None of the prior art of record nor a search in the pertinent art area teaches the exact species.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Hong Liu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by the phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached at (703) 308-4716. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the actual number for official business is (703) 308-4556. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose number is (703) 308-1235.

hl  
September 12, 2003

  
Mukund Shah  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1624